



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,787	11/14/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	60027.0074US01	8852
39262	7590	03/13/2006	EXAMINER	
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION				NAWAZ, ASAD M
P.O. BOX 2903				ART UNIT
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				PAPER NUMBER
				2155

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/993,787	KIRKPATRICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed 12/28/05. Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. No other claims have been added, amended, or canceled. Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Nelson et al (US Patent No. 5,999,948) hereinafter referred to as Nelson further in view of Conner et al (USPN: 6718515).

As to claim 1, Nelson teaches a method for presenting forms and publishing form data, said method comprising: maintaining a field engine table, said table comprising data identifying one or more fields of a form.(Abstract; col 3, lines 17-24; col4, lines 25-39)

Receiving a request for a network resource including said form; (col 3, lines 25-36)

In response to said request, determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized to respond to said request (col 5, lines 34-64; col 8, lines 1-12)

In response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized to respond to said request, creating an executable class file capable of generating markup language for displaying said fields of said form in a web browser. (col 5, lines 1-9 and 34-64; col 7, lines 46-67; col 8, lines 1-12)

Generating markup language by executing said class file and returning said markup language as a response to said request for a network resource. (col 3, lines 25-36; col 5, lines 34-64)

However, Nelson does not explicitly indicate wherein a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request.

Conner et al teaches a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request. More specifically, a .jsp extension calls the reusable components of JAVA (fig 2, col 4 line 59 to col 5, line 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Conner et al into those of Nelson in order to make the system efficient. By being able to determine the runtime extension based

Art Unit: 2155

upon the file extension of a request for content, a system would simply reference the file extension in treating the content requests.

Claims 8 and 14 are essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 2, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized comprises determining whether said request for said network resource was a first request for said network resource. (col 7, lines 46-60; col 8, lines 1-12)

As to claim 3, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized comprises determining whether said request for said network resource was a first request for said network resource or whether a web server operative to provide said network resource was reset since the last time said network resource was accessed. (col 7, lines 46-60; col 8, lines 1-12)

Claims 9 and 16 are essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 4, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said field engine table further comprises data indicating a data type for each of said fields. (col 4, lines 25-39; col 6, lines 44-46)

Claim 10 is essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 5, Nelson teaches the method of claim 4, wherein said field engine table further comprises a form name and a version number corresponding to each of said fields (col 3, lines 8-12; col 8, lines 57-61)

Claim 11 is essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 6, Nelson teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the said field engine table further comprises field names for each of said fields of said form and wherein the said field names are associated with each of said fields by said class file.(col 3, lines 25-36; col 4, lines 25-39; col 8, lines 1-12)

Claims 12 and 15 are essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 7, Nelson teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising receiving a request to publish response data associated with each of said field names;(col 5, lines 36-64)

And storing said response data associated with each of said field names in an output table having fields with names identical to said field names.(col 8, lines 57-61; col 13, lines 3-17)

Claims 13 and 17 are essentially the system and computer-medium for the method claim above and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion


Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER